Case4:11-cv-02584-PJH Document26 Filed08/25/11 Page1 of 4

1 2 3 4 5	RENU R. GEORGE, CA State Bar No. 259962 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI Professional Corporation 650 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050 Telephone: (650) 493-9300 Facsimile: (650) 565-5100 Email: RGeorge@wsgr.com TONIA OUELLETTE KLAUSNER, (Pro hac vio	ce)		
6	WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI Professional Corporation			
7	1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor New York, NY 10019-6022			
8	Telephone: (212) 999-5800 Facsimile: (212) 999-5899			
9	Email: TKlausner@wsgr.com			
10	GERARD M. STEGMAIER, (<i>Pro hac vice</i>) WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI			
11	Professional Corporation			
12	1700 K Street, NW, Fifth Floor Washington, D.C. 20006-3817			
13	Telephone: (202) 973-8800 Facsimile: (202) 973-8899			
14	Email: GStegmaier@wsgr.com			
15	Attorneys for Defendant GroupMe, Inc.			
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
18	OAKLAND	DIVI	SION	
19	DDIAN CLAUSED individually and an habalf	`		
20	BRIAN GLAUSER, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,)	CASE NO.:	4:11-cv-02584-РЈН
21	Plaintiffs,)		T GROUPME, INC.'S FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE
22	v.)	IN SUPPOR'	T OF ITS MOTION TO
23	TWILIO, INC., a Delaware corporation,)	ŕ	TAY OR TRANSFER
24	GROUPME, INC., a Delaware corporation,)	Date:	led: May 27, 2011 October 12, 2011
25	Defendant.)	Time: Courtroom:	9:00 am 3,
26)	Judge:	Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton
27				
28				
	GROUPME, INC.'S REQUEST FOR JUD. NOTICE ISO OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS, STAY OR TRANSFER CASE NO. 4:11-cv-02584-PJH			

Case4:11-cv-02584-PJH Document26 Filed08/25/11 Page2 of 4

1	Defendant GroupMe, Inc. ("GroupMe") hereby respectfully requests that the Court take					
2	judicial notice, pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, of the documents,					
3	referenced below, which are submitted as exhibits to the Declaration of Tonia Ouellette					
4	Klausner, dated August 25, 2011, in Support of GroupMe's Motion to Dismiss, Stay or Transfer.					
5 6	Ex. B	Senate Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 102nd Congress, on November 26, 1991 regarding the Automated Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 137 Cong.				
7		Rec. S18317-01 (1991).				
8	Ex. C	Telephone Advertising Regulation Act, House Report No. 101–633 (1990)				
9	Ex. D	Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Senate Report No. 102-178 (1991)				
10 11	Ex. E	Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, House Report No. 102-317 (1991)				
12	Ex. F	Senate Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the				
13		102nd Congress, on November 27, 1991 regarding the Automated Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 137 Cong. Rec. S18781-02 (1991).				
14 15	Ex. G	Federal Communication Commission's ("FCC") Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 7 FCC Rcd 8752 (1992).				
16 17	Ex. H	FCC's Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 18 FCC Rcd 14014 (Report and Order, 2003)				
18	Ex. I	FCC's Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone				
19		Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 19 FCC Rcd 19215 (Order, 2004)				
20	Ex. J	FCC Public Notice, 24 FCC Rcd 13635 (CGB 2009)				
21	Ex. K	FCC's Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone				
22 23		Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Memorandum Opinion and Order, 17 FCC Rcd 17459 (2002).				
24	Ex. L	FCC's Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone				
25		Consumer Protection Act of 1991, CG Docket No. 02-278, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 25 FCC Rcd 1501 (2010)				
26	Ex. M	Soundbite Communications Comments, CG Docket No. 02-278 (filed May 21, 2010)				
27		(1110a 111ay 21, 2010)				
28						

Case4:11-cv-02584-PJH Document26 Filed08/25/11 Page3 of 4

I				
1	Ex. N	Reply Comments of J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., CG Docket No. 27-278 (filed June 21, 2010)		
3	Ex. O	Notice of <i>Ex Parte</i> Presentation to Marlene Dortch, FCC, from Michele Farquhar, Counsel to Encore Capital Group, Inc., (filed May 5, 2011)		
4 5	Ex. P	Reply Comments of CTIA, CG Docket No. 02-278 (filed June 21, 2010)		
6	Ex. Q	Comments of Sprint Nextel, CG Docket No. 02-278 (filed May 21, 2010)		
Ex. R Reply Comments of PRA, CG Docket No. 21, 2010)		Reply Comments of PRA, CG Docket No. 02-278 (filed June 21, 2010)		
9	Ex. S	Reply Comments of the Cargo Airline Association, CG Docket No. 02-278 (filed June 21, 2010)		
10 11	Ex. T	Comments of the United Parcel Service, Inc. in Response to Global Tel*Link Corporations Petition for Declaratory Ruling (filed July 15, 2010)		
12 13	Ex. U	Comments of Wells Fargo & Co., (filed May 21, 2010)		
14	Judicial notice of	of Exhibits B-U is appropriate because Exhibits B-U are legislative		
15	histories of a statute, governmental reports, and/or documents that are administered by or			
	publicly filed with the administrative agency that are not subject to reasonable dispute and are "capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot			
16				
17	reasonably be questioned." FED. R. EVID. 201(B); see also Lemperle v. Wash. Mut. Bank, No. 10-			
18	cv-1550, 2010 WL 3958729, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2010) ("Judicial notice is also			
19	appropriate because government reports and publications [are] judicially noticeable."). The			
20	court may take also take judicial notice of these documents because they are legislative histories of statutes, which would include Exhibits B-F, and documents administered by or filed with and			
21				
22	administrative agency, such as Exhibits G-U. See Rocky Mtn. Farmers Union v. Goldstene, 719			
23 24	F. Supp. 2d 1170, 1186 (E.D. Cal. 2010) (legislative histories); Northwest Envtl. Advocates v.			
	EPA, 537 F.3d 1006, 1026–27 (9th Cir. 2008) (taking judicial notice of contents of EPA's request			
	for public comment); see also Moore v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc., No. 09-1823, 2010 WL			
26 3619877, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 10, 2010) (taking judicial notice of published decisions, of				
28	and policy statements of the FCC); Greene v. T–Mobile USA, Inc., No. 07-1563, 2008 WL			
_~	GROUPME, INC.'S REQUEST OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS,			

GROUPME, INC.'S REQUEST FOR JUD. NOTICE ISO OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS, STAY OR TRANSFER CASE NO. 4:11-cv-02584-PJH

Case4:11-cv-02584-PJH Document26 Filed08/25/11 Page4 of 4

1	351017, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 7, 2008) (taking judicial notice of comments and petitions filed					
2	with the FCC).					
3	<u>CONCLUSION</u>					
4	For the foregoing reasons, GroupMe requests that the Court consider the above-					
5	referenced documents in connection with GroupMe's Motion to Dismiss, Stay or Transfer.					
6						
7						
8						
9	DATED: August 25, 2011	Respectfully submitted,				
10		WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI Professional Corporation				
11		1				
12		By: <u>/s/ Renu R. George</u> Renu R. George				
13						
14		Attorneys for Defendant GroupMe, Inc.				
15						
16						
17						
18						
19 20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
	GROUPME, INC.'S REQUEST FOR JUD. NOTICE ISO	-3-				

GROUPME, INC.'S REQUEST FOR JUD. NOTICE ISC OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS, STAY OR TRANSFER CASE NO. 4:11-cv-02584-PJH